

Kern and Beveridge

John W. Kern, democratic nominee for the United States senate, is no stranger to the people of Indiana. Candidate for governor in 1900 and in 1904, and for vice president in 1908, his name is familiar to every intelligent voter throughout the length and breadth of the state.

His opponent for the office to which he now aspires is the present senior senator, Albert J. Beveridge.

Senator Beveridge is also well known to the voters of Indiana, having been United States senator since 1899

Senator Beveridge is classed among the so-called "progressive," or "insurgent" republicans.

He voted against the Payne-Aldrich republican tariff bill not because he has ceased to be an adherent of the "beneficent" system of protection, but by reason of the fact that he differed from his party associates on some questions of detail in the distribution of the tariff plunder.

John W. Kern has all his life been opposed to that principle of legislation which "lays with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other bestows it upon favored individuals, to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes."

Senator Beveridge appeals to the democratic and independent voters on the ground that he has "progressed" (quite recently) to the point where he is inclined to question the wisdom of a schedule here and there in a general system of tariff taxation for the purpose of affording protection to certain industries, and to enable the owners of those industries to make "a reasonable profit" at the expense of the general public.

John W. Kern is opposed to that system altogether, root and branch, lock and key. He believes that the government exceeds its legitimate function when it employs the power of taxation against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to impoverish the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other.

Senator Beveridge makes another special appeal to the labor vote. He asks for the support of organized labor because he introduced into the United States senate a child labor bill. In 1897, in a debate with Mr. Bryan, published in the Reader Magazine, Senator Beveridge said he intended to press his child labor bill to a final vote at the next session of congress. Two sessions—one general, and one special—have been held since then. Senator Beveridge has not pressed his child labor bill to a vote. Why? Probably because Senator Beveridge agrees with the best constitutional lawyers in the senate in the opinion that it is properly a subject of state and not of federal legislation. He introduced it and parades it for campaign purposes.

Years ago, before Albert J. Beveridge was thought of as a senator, John W. Kern not only talked in favor of a law protecting children, but voted for, and secured the enactment of such a law. In 1893, John W. Kern was a member of the state legislature, representing Marion county in the senate.

During the session of 1893, the legislative committee of organized labor requested the legislature to enact a law providing that children under the age of fourteen years should not be employed by any person or corporation engaged in manufacturing iron, steel nails, metals, machinery or tobacco, and that no child under fourteen years of age engaged in any manufacturing business should be permitted to work more than eight hours a day. John W. Kern championed this bill in the Indiana assembly, spoke for it, voted for it, stayed with it by night and day, secured its passage through both houses, and it was signed by the governor on the 25th day of February, 1893. It is substantially the law of Indiana today.

From these two records—one of promises, the other of deeds, the laboring man may readily perceive the characteristics of the two men.

The one, as a state senator, seventeen years ago championed a child labor bill and secured its enactment into law. Since then he has been twice a candidate for governor, once a candidate for vice president, and now is a candidate for United States senator. In all these campaigns he has solicited the workingman for his vote, yet never once in any speech has he referred to his part in the enactment of this law. It is doubtful if one laboring man out of ten, at the present time, knows of this record of John W. Kern. He has not paraded it before the public, but trusted that those interested in the

subject would take the trouble to examine the record for themselves.

Senator Beveridge introduced a bill on the subject several years ago. He has talked about it every since, and written about it in the magazines. He has never brought it to a vote. He has nursed it as his political stock in trade and today is still talking about what he intends to do about it at some future time.

This record of the deeds of Kern, and of the words of Beveridge; of the modest performance of the one, and the eternal parading of the other, illustrates completely the character of the two men.—Indianapolis New Era.

Practical Tariff Talks

A Commoner reader asks for some more information about schedule K, the woolen schedule. This is one which even President Taft said is indefensible, and it is. In the discussion of the Payne bill, Congressman Sisson of Mississippi made a most illuminating delineation of the iniquities of this schedule. It is too long to reproduce here, but some of the salient features follow. He produced statistics to show that the value of the woolen manufactures of the United States in 1905 was \$767,210,900. If these same goods had been purchased abroad they would have cost \$404,651,368. This leaves a margin of protection on manufactures of wool of \$362,569,622, which is the excess paid by the users of woollens for the privilege of having them manufactured in this country rather than abroad. Mr. Sisson estimated that the labor cost of producing these goods in America was \$135,069,063. If the American workman in the woolen mills earns twice as much as does the woolen worker abroad, then the difference in labor cost is represented by half that sum, or \$67,534,000. The difference between the protection given, \$362,000,000 and the sum paid by the manufacturers to their workmen in excess of what the European manufacturer pays his workmen, is \$295,000,000. This money goes into the pockets of the manufacturers and not into the treasury of the United States.

Every time we buy \$1 worth of foreign goods we purchase \$34 worth from our home manufacturers, said Mr. Sisson. Every time \$1 is paid into the national treasury under this woolen schedule from woolen imports, \$14.40 clean, clear-cut profit over and above a legitimate foreign profit, over and above cost of labor at home, over and above freight charges across the

Atlantic, goes into the pockets of the manufacturer of woolen goods. To illustrate how the consumer is hit, Mr. Sisson took a wool hat such as costs the jobber \$2 here and \$1 abroad. The wholesale merchant adds 20 per cent to the cost for his profit. This makes 40 cents profit instead of 20, as it would have been had he paid but \$1 for the hat. Then the retail merchant wants 10 per cent to cover cost of carriage and 25 per cent for his profit. He adds 35 per cent to the \$2.40 cost, and sells the hat for \$3.25. Thus a hat that would cost the wholesaler in the English market \$1 has grown so fast in value that when it is purchased by an American the cost to him has advanced 224 per cent, while the tariff was a little less than 100 per cent.

The clothing item comes very close home to every person. In 1905 there was manufactured in America \$356,000,000 worth of men's clothing. None of this was imported; all was used here at home. The importation of clothing was very small, a little less than \$2,000,000, and the tariff duty collected was \$1,500,000. The duty on men's clothing averages about 82 per cent. There is left a margin for protection on the whole output the sum of \$170,000,000. Allowing that the American clothing worker gets twice as much as the similar workman abroad, the difference in cost of labor would be one-half the total sum paid out in this country (\$57,000,000) or \$28,500,000, leaving a net margin to the American manufacturers of \$141,500,000. This is what the American manufacturer can charge over and above the legitimate profit of the foreign manufacturer, and what tariff schedule K permits him to charge. If he does not charge it, then the tariff is too high and ought to be reduced because he has unnecessary protection. If he does charge the full price the tariff permits him to charge, then he is enriching himself at the expense of the men who must buy what he consumes.

It is not beyond reason to argue that if a citizen believed that when he paid \$2 for a woolen garment, 95 cents of it went to the treasury to pay expenses of government, he would not object. If he believed that of that \$2 there was paid to the man whose labor went into it 33 cents to enable him to have a higher standard of living than the foreign wool worker he might not protest. But if he knew that of that excess of 95 cents, 62 cents went to the manufacturer and that for every dollar of revenue from this source to the government the manufacturer drew \$82 profit he would have something to say. And yet this is the division shown by the figures. C. Q. D.

The Commoner's Million Army

In the campaign of 1908 The Commoner's Million Army rendered distinguished service to the cause of democracy and it may well be believed that a similar organization will even be able to do better work in the year of 1910 now that men who were heretofore indifferent are aroused to the importance of action.

If half of the readers of The Commoner would take active interest in the organization of this Million Army plan, the results would be immediately noticeable and the contribution to the

welfare of popular government would be enormous.

Many individuals are willing to help in a patriotic movement but find it difficult to know just what to do to make their efforts count. In a struggle such as the one we are now engaging in, the efforts of every man, woman and child on the side of popular government will count and in The Commoner's Million Army a practical plan is presented whereby the efforts of many individuals may be aggregated and used with telling effect.

<p>Recommendation for Membership</p> <p>The signer of this enlistment blank is personally known to me, and is in every way worthy of membership in The Commoner's Million Army.</p> <p>Signed.....</p> <p>Address.....</p>	<p>APPLICATION BLANK</p> <h2 style="text-align: center;">The Commoner's Million Army</h2> <p>I hereby enlist in The Commoner's Million Army, and pledge my assistance to secure the nomination of only worthy and incorruptible men as democratic candidates; that I will attend democratic primaries and nominating conventions, and assist in promoting the great democratic campaign of education by devoting a reasonable share of my time to the distribution of literature. I will recommend worthy persons for membership in The Commoner's Million Army, and in any way I can assist to increase the usefulness of this organization.</p> <p>Signed.....</p> <p>Address.....</p> <p>With the understanding that Mr. Bryan agrees to accept annual subscriptions to The Commoner from members of this Army at a net rate of 66 cents each, and that each subscription to The Commoner shall include a subscription to The American Homestead (a strong home and farm paper)—thus leaving The Commoner free to devote its undivided efforts to political matters and current events—I enclose herewith 66 cents for one annual subscription to The Commoner (including The American Homestead).</p> <p>If you are already a subscriber to The Commoner and do not care to extend your expiration date at this time, the last paragraph above may be disregarded.</p>
---	--